

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 - 25 and 27 were rejected as being unpatentable over Jenson U.S. 5,457,476 ["Jenson"] in view of Bauer U.S. 5,877,759 ["Bauer"]. The Examiner states that Jenson discloses a portable, hand held housing personal organizer and Bauer discloses an interface containing multiple calendars. As to claim 1 this rejection is traversed; claims 7, 11, 18, 20 and 22 are amended herein and Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims now in the application are in condition for allowance.

As to claim 1:

Applicants' invention as claimed in claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Jenson in view of Bauer. The claimed invention features a portable data storage module comprising a portable, hand-held housing, an input device situated on a top face of the housing and adapted for allowing input of data, a display situated on the top face of the housing and adapted for depicting data, memory situated in the interior space of the housing for storing a plurality of calendars each including a plurality of scheduled matters, and a controller situated in the interior space of the housing and connected between the input device, the display, and the memory, the controller suitable for simultaneously depicting a plurality of the calendars on the display.

Neither Jenson nor Bauer nor any combination of them describes or suggests Applicants' invention as claimed in claim 1. In contrast to Applicants' invention, Jenson discloses a portable, hand held-housing (Fig. 2), an input device in the form of a screen and an input stylus (Col. 5, lines 48-50), memory (Col. 4, lines 23-24), and a central processing unit (Col. 4, lines 22-23). Jenson fails to teach or suggest a portable storage module for simultaneously depicting multiple calendars in a single display on a top face of a PDA or a controller suitable for simultaneously depicting a plurality of the calendars on the display. Bauer discloses a user interface for Internet and intranet agents (Col. 2, lines 48-50). In particular, Bauer discloses a user interface in the form of a

a

browser in which the schedules of various individuals are compared side by side (Col. 14, lines 19-20). Bauer does not teach, hint or suggest a portable hand held housing, an input device situated on the top face of the housing, a display situated on the top face of the housing, memory, and a controller situated in the interior space of the portable, hand-held housing and suitable for simultaneously depicting a plurality of the calendars on a display.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention of Applicants' claim 1 would not have been obvious over Jenson in view of Bauer because, to the extent it may be relevant, Bauer teaches away from the claimed invention. Bauer discloses a browser, such as Internet and intranet agents (Col. 2, lines 48-49), that displays the schedules of various individuals (Col. 14, lines 19-28). A standard browser for Internet navigation allowing multiple calendars to be displayed on a monitor requires circuitry and components typical of a desktop or laptop computer. These desktop and laptop computers have more circuitry and processing power which allows them to process more tasks and to process these tasks more quickly than a PDA. Though this additional circuitry is advantageous for several applications, the circuitry allowing a desktop or laptop computer to navigate the internet as disclosed by Bauer could not be incorporated within a portable PDA unit such as the one claimed in the present application. Portable PDAs do not currently have sufficient memory or physical space to include such additional hardware. Further, a standard monitor used with a desktop or laptop computer is much larger than the PDA display of the claimed invention. In particular, these computers are typically used with corresponding large and separate monitors or built-in fold-up monitors. The method of displaying multiple calendars by the browser disclosed in Bauer, as shown in Bower figure 9, can not work with a PDA as claimed in claim 1 because a PDA contains screen small enough to be "situated on the top face" of the PDA. Such small screens would require the browser to be displayed on a drastically reduced scale or display only a portion of the browser at any time, thus making the browser extremely difficult to read and work with.



Accordingly, since the computer components and monitor required by Bauer to navigate the Internet and display multiple calendars teach away from the present invention, the Examiner improperly combines Bauer and Jenson. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Jenson in view of Bauer and respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

As to Claim 7:

Claim 7 was rejected for obviousness over Jenson in view of Bauer. The Examiner states that Bauer discloses depicting at least one calendar (Fig. 9), depicting icons corresponding to time increments of hours, days, and weeks (Col. 14, lines 29-38), allowing selection of one of the icons (Col. 14, lines 37-38), and dividing at least one calendar into the time increments corresponding to the selected icon (Col. 14, 29-38). The Examiner further states that portable electronic devices displaying a calendar are known in the art.

The invention of claim 7 as amended is patentable over any combination of Jenson and Bauer. In contrast to Applicants' invention, Bauer teaches away from displaying and manipulating at least one calendar on a display situated on the top face of a PDA. As discussed above, Bauer discloses that a browser for navigating the Internet capable of displaying multiple calendars requires extensive computer hardware, such as the circuitry and components within a laptop or desktop computer, and a large separate monitor for a desktop computer or fold-up monitor for a laptop computer. Unlike Bauer or Jenson, the claimed invention teaches displaying and manipulating at least one calendar on a display situated on the top face of a PDA. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits the claimed invention as claimed in amended claim 7 is patentable over Bauer in view of Jenson and respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

As to Claim 11

Claim 11 was rejected for obviousness over Jenson in view of Bauer. The Examiner states that Bauer discloses providing a window which identifies each of the calendars (Fig. 9), allowing

selection of the identified calendars (Fig. 9), simultaneously displaying all of the selected calendars (Fig. 9). The Examiner further states that it is known in the art that portable electronic devices can contain a user's calendar.

The invention as claimed in amended claim 11 is patentable over Jenson in view of Bauer. In contrast to the present invention, Bauer teaches away from controlling the presentation of a plurality of calendars including the operation of providing a window on a display of a portable data storage module which identifies each of the calendars, the display situated on a top face of the portable data storage module. As discussed above, Bauer discloses that a browser for navigating the Internet capable of displaying multiple calendars requires extensive computer hardware, such as the circuitry and components within a laptop or desktop computer, and a large separate monitor for a desktop computer or fold-up monitor for a laptop computer. Unlike Bauer or Jenson, the claimed invention teaches displaying and manipulating a plurality of calendars on a display situated on the top face of a PDA. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit the invention of claim 11 as amended is patentable over Jenson in view of Bauer, and respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

As to Claim 18

Claim 18 was rejected for obviousness over Jenson in view of Bauer. The Examiner states that Jenson discloses depicting a calendar on a display of a portable data storage module (Figs. 2-13), wherein the calendar is divided into sections corresponding to time increments and depicting scheduled matters in the sections (Figs. 8, 11-13), altering a size of the sections as a function of the number of days simultaneously depicted (Figs. 7, 8). The Examiner further states that it is known in the art that multiple calendars can be displayed simultaneously.

The invention of claim 18 as amended is patentable over Jenson in view of Bauer. In contrast to the present invention, Jenson does not teach, hint or suggest depicting a **plurality** of calendars simultaneously on a display of a portable data storage module, the display situated on a

top face of the portable data storage module, wherein each calendar is divided into sections corresponding to increments of time and scheduled matters are depicted in the sections. Jenson discloses depicting a single calendar on a PDA. Furthermore, a plurality of calendars depicted on a top face of a display of a PDA is neither suggested nor disclosed by Bauer, nor has the Examiner shown that this is "known in the art". Unlike Applicants' invention, Bauer discloses that a browser for navigating the Internet capable of displaying multiple calendars requires extensive computer hardware, such as the circuitry and components within a laptop or desktop computer, and a large separate monitor for a desktop computer or fold-up monitor for a laptop computer. Such extensive hardware and monitors disclosed by Bauer would not be suitable for use in the present invention as claimed in claim 11. Unlike Bauer and Jenson, the claimed invention features displaying and manipulating a plurality of calendars on a display situated on the top face of a PDA, where it is commonly known that a PDA has a much smaller housing and display than desktop and laptop computers. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits the invention of Applicants' amended claim 18 is patentably distinguishable from Jenson in view of Bauer, and respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

As to Claim 20

Claim 20 was rejected for obviousness over Jenson in view of Bauer. The Examiner states that Jenson discloses depicting a calendar on a display of a portable data storage module (Figs. 2-13) and altering movement of the scheduled matter of the calendar (Col. 2, lines 48-57). The Examiner further states that it is known in the art that multiple calendars can be displayed simultaneously.

The invention of claim 18 as amended is patentable over Jenson in view of Bauer. In contrast to the present invention, Jenson does not teach, hint or suggest depicting a **plurality** of calendars with scheduled matters on a display of a **portable data storage module**, the display

situated on a top face of the portable data storage module. Jenson discloses depicting a single calendar on a PDA. Furthermore, a plurality of calendars depicted on a top face of a display is neither suggested nor disclosed by Bauer or known in the art. Unlike the present invention, Bauer discloses that a browser for navigating the Internet capable of displaying multiple calendars requires extensive computer hardware, such as the circuitry and components within a laptop or desktop computer, and a large separate monitor for a desktop computer or fold-up monitor for a laptop computer. Such extensive hardware and monitors disclosed by Bauer would not be suitable for use in Applicants' invention of claim 18. Unlike Bauer and Jenson, the claimed invention teaches displaying and manipulating a plurality of calendars on a display situated on the top face of a PDA. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits the invention of amended claim 20 is patentably distinguishable from Jenson in view of Bauer, and respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

As to Claim 22

Claim 22 was rejected for obviousness over Jenson in view of Bauer. The Examiner states that Bauer discloses providing plural calendar bases (Fig. 9; Col. 14, lines 19-28), providing a common data base 52 (Fig. 3b) including plural identification data sets having attributes corresponding to the calendar database (Col. 14, lines 8-11), displaying the calendars accordingly (Fig. 9). The Examiner further states that it is known in the art that portable electronic devices can contain a user's calendar.

The invention of Applicants' amended claim 22 is patentable over Jenson in view of Bauer. In contrast to the present invention, Bauer teaches away from displaying the calendars of the calendar databases **on a top face of the portable data storage module** in accordance with the attributes. As discussed above, Bauer discloses that a browser for navigating the Internet capable of displaying multiple calendars requires extensive computer hardware, such as the circuitry and

components within a laptop or desktop computer, and a large separate monitor for a desktop computer or fold-up monitor for a laptop computer. Unlike Bauer and Jenson, the claimed invention teaches displaying and manipulating a plurality of calendars on a display situated on the top face of a PDA. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits the invention of amended claim 22 is patentably distinguishable from Bauer in view of Jenson, and respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Neither Jenson nor Bauer nor any combination of Jenson and Bauer describes or suggests Applicants' invention as claimed in claims 1, 7, 11, 18, 20 and 22 of the present application. Dependent claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-17, 19, 21 and 23-27 directly or indirectly depend from and contain all the patentably distinguishing limitations of allowable independent claims 1, 7, 11, 18, 20 and 22, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-17, 19, 21 and 23-27 are allowable over the art of record and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn as to all the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and action to that effect is requested.

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement accompanies this Amendment.

This Amendment is being filed within the first month following the shortened statutory period set by the Examiner for response and, accordingly, it is accompanied by a petition for one month's extension of time for reply and a fee or fee authorization therefor. In the unlikely event the petition or fee may become separated from this Amendment, or in the event the Examiner may determine that a further extension of time or fee[s] may be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, petition is hereby made therefor, and the Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0384 (Order PFTRP002).

If the Examiner believes that a conference would facilitate prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicant's representative, undersigned, at the number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
HICKMAN COLEMAN & HUGHES, LLP



Paul L. Hickman  
Reg. No. 28,516

P.O. Box 52037  
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0746  
Telephone: (650) 470-7430

